REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed August 31, 2006. This amendment should obviate outstanding issues and make the pending claims allowable. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of this response/amendment.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-38 are pending.

Claim 7 stands objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 7 depends from claim 7.

Claim 18 would be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate if claim 12 is allowed. Claim 18 is cancelled via the current amendment.

Claims 1-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 6,668,253 (Thompson et al.) in view of U.S. PG Pub. No. 2003/0172091 (Norcott).

OVERVIEW OF CLAIMED INVENTION

The system and method of the present invention utilizes operational metadata obtained from a data-warehousing environment to dynamically capture data warehouse population activities. Operational metadata containing ETL task definitions, control flow, execution schedules, and execution statuses obtained from a data warehouse is utilized by trigger mechanisms, staging tables, and an archived warehouse metadata table to store specified ETL task information. ETL information is extracted from operational metadata, filtered for specified

ETL task data, transformed to a format necessary for storage in an ETL task staging table, and finally, archived in an archived warehouse metadata table.

OBJECTIONS

A minor amendment has been made to claim 7 to correct the dependency error without adding new matter.

DOUBLE PATENTING

Claim 18 has been cancelled via the current amendment. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to remove the double patenting rejection.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended without adding new matter. Applicants hereby respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection with respect to claim 29. Claim 29 has been amended to recite a tangible system structure without adding new matter. Applicants hereby respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection with respect to claim 29.

As per the Examiner's suggestion, claim 30 has been amended to recite "computer storage medium" instead of "computer usable medium". No new matter has been added via the current amendment. Applicants hereby respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection with respect to claim 30.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 6,668,253 (Thompson et al.) in view of U.S. PG Pub. No. 2003/0172091 (Norcott). To be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), each and every element of the claims must be addressed through known prior art or be recognized as an obvious variation thereof. Applicant contends that the above mentioned specific combination of the Thompson et al. and Norcott references fails to provide many of the features of Applicants' pending claims 1-38.

Thompson et al. teaches a system for enterprise information management comprising: a data warehouse server; a transformation and staging server connected to the data warehouse server for providing transformed and cleansed data to the data warehouse server; a data source application connected to the transformation and staging server to provide data to the transformation and staging server; a financial consolidation application connected to the transformation and staging server for performing consolidation and reporting of financial data; a web server connected to the data warehouse server; and a plurality of clients connectable to the web server for accessing data from the data warehouse server via the web server.

Norcott teaches a method for synchronous change data capture, comprising the steps of: generating a transaction identifier that uniquely identifies a transaction, for each operation in a transaction, recording change data for the operation and the transaction identifier in a first database object, and during a commit of the transaction, recording the transaction identifier and a system change number in a second database object.

With respect to independent claim 1, the Examiner contends on page 5 of the Office Action of August 31, 2006 that Thompson on column 4, lines 56-59 teaches the feature of "refreshing said buffer with changes in said operational metadata". Further, the Examiner states

on the same page of the Office Action of August 31, 2006 that the Abstract of Thompson teaches the feature of "moving task information from said buffer to an archive".

Column 4, lines 56-59 of Thompson is reproduced below:

"Sometimes the loading of information comprises one of: a round-robin approach used for refresh processing and extracting information from permanent tables; and a see-saw approach used for non-refresh processing and extracting information from temporary tables."

It can be seen that the above-citation merely teaches the two ways anticipated by Thompson for loading information – one being the round-robin approach and the other being the see-saw approach.

The Abstract of Thompson merely teaches a transformation and staging server that obtains data from the data source application via requests and places the data into temporary staging tables to prepare for the transformation and cleansing process prior to movement of the data to the data warehouse server.

Applicants are unsure how the Examiner is interpreting the use of a round-robin approach and the placement of data in temporary staging tables to read on Claim 1's feature of "refreshing said buffer with changes in said operational metadata and moving task information from said buffer to an archive". Absent such a showing in either Thompson or Norcott, Applicants respectfully submit that Thompson and Norcott, either individually or in combination cannot render obvious Applicants' claim 1.

The above-mentioned argument for claim 1 substantially applies for claim 30 as it recites an article of manufacture with similar features.

If the Examiner still feels that the Abstract of Thompson or the Norcott reference teaches claim 1 and 30's features of refreshing said buffer with changes in said operational metadata and moving task information from said buffer to an archive, Applicants respectfully remind the examiner that it is the duty of the examiner to specifically point out each and every limitation of a claim being rejected as per §1.104(c)(2) of Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations and section 707 of the M.P.E.P., which explicitly states that "the particular part relied on must be designated" and "the pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified".

Since neither Thompson nor Norcott teaches many of the features of Applicants' claim 1 and 30, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection with respect to claim 1 and 30.

With respect to claim 10, the Examiner once again repeats the assertion that the Thompson abstract teaches "storing results of said calculating step in a buffer and moving selected buffer to an archive". The Examiner is once again reminded that the Abstract merely teaches the transformation and staging server that obtains data from the data source application via requests and places the data into temporary staging tables to prepare for the transformation and cleansing process prior to movement of the data to the data warehouse server.

Applicants are again unsure regarding how the Examiner is interpreting the placement of data in temporary staging tables to read on Claim 1's feature of "storing results of said calculating step in a buffer and moving selected buffer to an archive". Absent such a showing in either Thompson or Norcott, Applicants respectfully submit that Thompson and Norcott, either individually or in combination cannot render obvious Applicants' claim 10.

Since neither Thompson nor Norcott teaches many of the features of Applicants'

claim 10, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection with respect to claim 10.

The above-mentioned arguments for claims 1, 10, and 30 substantially apply to claim 29 and Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection with respect to claim 29. The above-mentioned arguments also substantially apply to dependent claims 2-9, 11-17, 19-28, and 31-38 as they inherit all the features of the claim from which they depend.

SUMMARY

As has been detailed above, none of the references, cited or applied, provide for the specific claimed details of Applicants' presently claimed invention, nor renders them obvious. It is believed that this case is in condition for allowance and reconsideration thereof and early issuance is respectfully requested.

As this response has been timely filed, no request for extension of time or associated fee is required. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies in the fees provided to Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

If it is felt that an interview would expedite prosecution of this application, please do not hesitate to contact Applicants' representative at the below number.

Respectfully submitted,

/ramrajsoundararajan/

Ramraj Soundararajan
Registration No. 53,832

1725 Duke Street
Suite 650
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 838-7683

November 30, 2006